

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the final Office Action (hereinafter, the "Office Action") mailed June 24, 2005, and responsive to the Advisory Action. At the time of the last examination, Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were pending. By this response, Claims 11 and 12 are added. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and a petition and fee for a two month extension of time accompany this response. Accordingly, entry of the amendments made herein, and reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested. Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11 and 12 (of which Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are independent) will be pending for further consideration.

1) Re: claims 1, 4, 11 and 12

Claims 1 (or 4) recite a method (or an exchange) that receiv[es] (or includes a means for receiving) from [a] mobile terminal ... , a request to change a subscriber profile... , chang[es] (or includes a means for changing) [the] subscriber profile on the basis of the change request and retain[s] the changed subscriber profile, and retain[s] (or includes a means for retaining) information indicating that the subscriber profile has been changed."

According to these recited features, for example, when the mobile terminal moves from the service area of the current exchange to the service area of another exchange, the current exchange can decide whether it is necessary to transmit the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station or not.

In the last response (dated September 22, 2005), the Applicants asserted that neither Toyoda et al. (U.S. 6,594,490), Sasuta et al. (U.S. 6,134,446) nor Sanchez (U.S. 6,449,479) discloses a recited feature of Claims 1 and 4; namely, retaining information indicating that the subscriber profile has been changed. The Advisory Action alleges that Column 7, lines 25-43 of

Sanchez discloses such feature. However, Column 7, lines 25-43 of Sanchez only discloses (A) that after the MSC/VLR node 65, 75 of Figure 1 which corresponds to an exchange has updated the profile, the MSC/VLR node 65, 75 sends the Feature Request (FEATREQ) message 280 to the HLR 80, and the HLR 80 updates the profile, and (B) that the flag (FEATREQ data flag) is set in the FEATREQ message 280 to indicate that the profile update is requested. That is, the MSC/VLR node 65, 75 does not retain the FEATREQ data flag (which has been set).

Therefore, Sanchez does not disclose the above-mentioned recited feature of Claims 1 and 4; namely, retaining information indicating that the subscriber profile has been changed. Toyoda et al. and Sasuta et al. also do not disclose this feature of the present invention of claims 1 and 4. Therefore, Claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated nor rendered unpatentable over Toyoda, Sasuta, and Sanchez, either singly or in combination. New Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 4, respectively, and thus are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as their corresponding independent claim.

2) Re: claims 2 and 5-7 :

The Advisory Action makes no comments regarding our arguments for the patentability of Claims 2 and 5-7 made in the last response dated September 22, 2005. We thus repeat those arguments here. At page 2, lines 10-14 of the Office Action, the following is stated:

[T]he applicants submitted that the Toyoda reference does not teach that the subscriber profile is transmitted from the first exchange to the home memory station. The examiner states that in wireless communications system, it is inherent that when the profile of a mobile unit changes (i.e., change in subscription to service), the profile change will be communicated to the HLR (e.g., see Sasuta et al. – U.S. 6,134,446 – column 1, lines 57-63).

However, in claims 2 and 5-7, when the mobile terminal moves from the service area of the first exchange to the service area of the second exchange, the first exchange in whose service

area the mobile terminal was previously present transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station. This kind of feature is not disclosed in either of Sasuta or Toyoda. Further, it is not inherent in wireless communication system. That is, the normal method that one skilled in the art can conceive is that while the mobile terminal is present in the service area of an exchange and if the subscriber profile is changed, the exchange transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station.

In contrast, in Claims 2 and 5-7, the first exchange in whose service area the mobile terminal was previously present transmits the changed subscriber profile to the home memory station. Further, the home memory station transmits the changed subscriber profile to the second exchange. Thus, this kind of feature is not disclosed in Toyoda and Sasuta, and it is not inherent in wireless communication system, and therefore, Claims 2 and 5-7 are not anticipated by, nor rendered unpatentable over Toyoda and Sasuta (either singly or in combination).

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 should be withdrawn, and withdrawal is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21st day of November, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913